arXiv:cond-mat/9702203v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 21 Feb 1997

Non-Markovian Persistence and Nonequilibrium Critical Dynamics

Klaus Oerding[1,2], Stephen J. Cornell[3], and Alan J. Bray[3]
[1] *Department of Physics, University of Oxford OX1 3NP, UK.*
[2] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Düsseldorf, D-40225 Düsseldorf, Germany.*
[3] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, The University, Manchester M13 9PL, UK.*
(February 21, 1997)

The persistence exponent θ for the global order parameter, $M(t)$, of a system quenched from the disordered phase to its critical point describes the probability, $p(t) \sim t^{-\theta}$, that $M(t)$ does not change sign in the time interval t following the quench. We calculate θ to $O(\epsilon^2)$ for model A of critical dynamics (and to order ϵ for model C) and show that at this order $M(t)$ is a non-Markov process. Consequently, θ is a new exponent. The calculation is performed by expanding around a Markov process, using a simplified version of the perturbation theory recently introduced by Majumdar and Sire [Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1420 (1996)].

The 'persistence exponent', θ, which characterizes the decay of the probability that a stochastic variable exceeds a threshold value (typically its mean value) throughout a time interval, has attracted a great deal of recent interest [1–11]. One of the most surprising properties of this exponent is that its value is highly non-trivial even in simple systems. For example, θ is irrational for the $q > 2$ Potts model in one dimension [6] (where the fraction of spins that have not changed their state in the time t after a quench to $T = 0$ decays as $t^{-\theta}$) and is apparently not a simple fraction for the diffusion equation [9,10] (where the fraction of space where the diffusion field has always exceeded its mean decays as $t^{-\theta}$).

A recent study of non-equilibrium model A critical dynamics, where a system coarsens at its critical point starting from a disordered initial condition, looked at the probability $P(t_1, t_2)$ that the global magnetization does not change sign during the interval $t_1 < t < t_2$ [11]. The persistence exponent for this system is defined by $P(t_1, t_2) \sim (t_1/t_2)^\theta$ in the limit $t_2/t_1 \to \infty$. Explicit results were obtained for the 1D Ising model, the $n \to \infty$ limit of the $O(n)$ model, and to order $\epsilon = 4 - d$ near dimension $d = 4$. For these systems it was found that the value of θ was related to the dynamic critical exponent z, the static critical exponent η, and 'nonequilibrium' exponent λ (which describes the decay of the autocorrelation with the initial condition, $\langle \phi(\mathbf{x}, t)\phi(\mathbf{x}, 0)\rangle \sim t^{-\lambda/z}$) by the scaling relation $\theta z = \lambda - d + 1 - \eta/2$. This relation may be derived from the assumption that the dynamics is Markovian, which is indeed the case for all of the cases considered in that paper.

From a consideration of the structure of the diagrams which appear at order ϵ^2 (and higher order), however, it was argued that the dynamics of the global order parameter should not be Markovian to all orders, implying that the exponent θ does not obey exactly that 'Markovian scaling relation' [11]. This means that θ is a new exponent. Monte-Carlo simulations in 2 dimensions indeed suggest weak violation of the Markov scaling relation [11].

In this Rapid Communication we present an explicit calculation of the non-Markovian properties of the global order parameter. The nonequilibrium magnetization-magnetization correlation function is calculated to order ϵ^2, and this is then used to calculate θ to the same order, using a perturbative method proposed by Majumdar and Sire (MS) [8], valid in the vicinity of a Markov process. The Markov scaling relation is shown explicitly to be violated at order ϵ^2, so θ is indeed a new independent exponent.

Before discussing the calculation of θ, however, we provide first a simpler, and more transparent, formulation of the perturbation theory than that given in MS. In particular the final result, Eq. (16), does not appear explicitly in MS [12].

Let $y(t)$ be a Gaussian stochastic process with zero mean, whose correlation function obeys dynamical scaling, i.e. $\langle y(t_1)y(t_2)\rangle = t_1^\alpha \Phi\left(t_1/t_2\right)$. Let $T = \ln t$ and $x(T) = y(t)/\left\langle y^2(t)\right\rangle^{1/2}$. Then $x(t)$ is a Gaussian *stationary* process with zero mean, i.e. its correlation function is translationally invariant, $\langle x(T_1)x(T_2)\rangle = A(T_2 - T_1)$. Notice that $A(0) = 1$ by construction, which convention we shall adopt throughout this Communication (in contrast to that of ref. [8]). If the persistence probability of y decays algebraically in t, then the persistence probability of $x(T)$ decays as $\sim \exp(-\theta T)$ for $T \to \infty$.

The persistence probability may be expressed as the ratio of two path integrals, as follows [8]:

$$P(x(T') > 0; 0 < T' < T) = \frac{\int_{x>0} Dx(T) \exp(-S)}{\int Dx(T) \exp(-S)}, \quad (1)$$

where

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int_0^T dT_1 \int_0^T dT_2\, x(T_1) G(T_1, T_2) x(T_2). \quad (2)$$

Here $G(T_1, T_2)$ is the matrix inverse of the correlation matrix $\langle x(T_1)x(T_2)\rangle \equiv A(T_2 - T_1)$. Notice that G is not

simply a function of $T_2 - T_1$ (unless we impose periodic boundary conditions).

In MS this path-integral formalism was used to map the Markov process onto a quantum harmonic oscillator in imaginary time, developing the perturbation theory in the formalism of quantum mechanics. We shall merely use path integrals as a convenient notation, performing all our calculations within the natural framework of stochastic processes.

Let $x^0(T)$ be a stationary Gaussian Markov process, i.e. one defined by

$$\frac{dx^0}{dT} = -\mu x^0 + \xi(T), \tag{3}$$

where ξ is a Gaussian white noise, with $\langle \xi(T)\xi(T')\rangle = 2\mu\delta(T-T')$. The noise strength has been chosen so that the autocorrelation function is $A^0(T) = \exp(-\mu T)$.

Suppose the process $x(T)$ is perturbatively close to a Markov process, in the sense that $G = G^0 + \epsilon g$. Then we can expand the exponentials in the path integrals in (1) and re-exponentiate, so that to $O(\epsilon)$ the numerator becomes

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}} Dx(T) e^{-S} = \int_{\mathcal{C}} Dx(T) \exp\left(-S^0 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\gamma(T) + O(\epsilon^2)\right), \tag{4}$$

where the subscript $\mathcal{C}$ represents the constraint $x(T') > 0$ $(0 < T' < T)$ on the paths in the integral in the numerator of (1), and

$$\gamma(T) = \int_0^T dT_1 \int_0^T dT_2\, g(T_1,T_2) A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T_1,T_2), \tag{5}$$

where

$$A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T_1,T_2) \equiv \frac{\int_{\mathcal{C}} Dx(T)\, x(T_1)x(T_2) e^{-S^0}}{\int_{\mathcal{C}} Dx(T)\, e^{-S^0}} \tag{6}$$

is the correlation function for the Markov process, averaged (and normalized) only over the paths consistent with the constraint $\mathcal{C}$. The denominator in (1) is given by an identical expression, except that $A^0_{\mathcal{C}}$ is replaced by A^0, the unconstrained correlation function.

By virtue of the constraint, $A^0_{\mathcal{C}}$ will not be strictly translationally invariant for finite T. In the limit $T \to \infty$, however, the double time-integral in (4) reduces to T times an infinite integral over the relative time $T_2 - T_1$, with $A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T_1,T_2)$ replaced by its stationary limit $A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T_2 - T_1)$. Similarly, g will be translationally invariant in this regime, giving

$$\gamma(T) \to T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (d\omega/2\pi)\, \tilde{g}(\omega) \tilde{A}^0_{\mathcal{C}}(\omega)\ , \tag{7}$$

where we have used the translational invariance to write the final result in Fourier space [14]. Note that the zeroth-order result $\int_{x>0} Dx(T)\exp(-S^0) / \int Dx(T)\exp(-S^0)$ is just the persistence probability of the stationary Gaussian Markov process $x^0(T)$, which decays as $\exp(-\mu T)$ as $T \to \infty$.

Using (1), (4) and (7), we find that the persistence exponent may be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned}\theta &\equiv \lim_{T\to\infty} -\frac{1}{T}\log\left[P(x(T') > 0; 0 < T' < T)\right] \\ &= \mu + \epsilon \int_0^\infty \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \tilde{g}(\omega)\left[\tilde{A}^0_{\mathcal{C}}(\omega) - \tilde{A}^0(\omega)\right] + O(\epsilon^2)\ . \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the term in $\tilde{A}^0(\omega)$ is the $O(\epsilon)$ contribution from the denominator in (1), and we have exploited the $\omega \to -\omega$ symmetry of the integrand.

We now calculate $A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T)$. The conditional probability $Q(x,T|x_0,0)$ for the stationary Markov process may be obtained directly from (3):

$$Q(x,T|x_0,0) = \left[\frac{1}{2\pi\left(1-e^{-2\mu T}\right)}\right]^{1/2} \exp\left[-\frac{\left(x - x_0 e^{-\mu T}\right)^2}{2\left(1-e^{-2\mu T}\right)}\right]. \tag{9}$$

The conditional probability $Q^+(x_2,T_2|x_1,T_1)$ that the process goes to (x_2,T_2), given that it started from (x_1,T_1), without x ever being negative is given by the method of images:

$$Q^+(2|1) = Q(x_2,T_2|x_1,T_1) - Q(x_2,T_2|-x_1,T_1), \tag{10}$$

where we have adopted an obvious shorthand notation for the arguments of Q^+.

To calculate the joint probability $P^+(x_1,T_1;x_2,T_2)$ that the process passes through x_1 at T_1 and x_2 at T_2, averaged only over paths where $x(T)$ is always positive, we consider a path starting at (x_i,T_i) and finishing at (x_f,T_f), passing through (x_1,T_1) and (x_2,T_2) without ever crossing the origin. Then the required stationary limit is

$$P^+(x_1,T_1;x_2,T_2) = \lim_{T_i\to-\infty, T_f\to\infty} \frac{Q^+(f;2;1|i)}{Q^+(f|i)}. \tag{11}$$

The Markov property means that we can decompose $Q^+(f;2;1|i) = Q^+(f|2)Q^+(2|1)Q^+(1|i)$. Using (9) and (10) in (11), we find

$$P^+(x_1,0;x_2,T) = \frac{2}{\pi}\left(1-e^{-2\mu T}\right)^{-1/2} x_1 x_2\, e^{\mu T} \times \tag{12}$$

$$\exp\left[-\frac{\left(x_1^2+x_2^2\right)}{2\left(1-e^{-2\mu T}\right)}\right] \sinh\left(\frac{x_1 x_2}{2\sinh\mu T}\right). \tag{13}$$

It is now straightforward to evaluate the autocorrelation function:

$$A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T) = \int_0^\infty dx_1 \int_0^\infty dx_2\, x_1 x_2 P^+(x_1,0;x_2,T) \tag{14}$$

$$= \frac{2}{\pi}\left[3\left(1-e^{-2\mu T}\right)^{1/2} + \left(e^{\mu T} + 2e^{-\mu T}\right)\sin^{-1} e^{-\mu T}\right]. \tag{15}$$

Eq. (8) for θ can now be expressed as a real-time integral as follows. We first write $A(T) = A^0(T) + \epsilon a(T)$, and we note that in Fourier space $\left[\tilde{A}(\omega)\right]^{-1} = \tilde{G}(\omega) = \tilde{G}^0(\omega) + \epsilon\tilde{g}(\omega)$. Using $A^0 = \exp(-\mu T)$ gives $\tilde{g}(\omega) = -\tilde{a}(\omega)(\omega^2+\mu^2)^2/4\mu^2$. Inserting this in (8), and transforming to real time, gives

$$\theta = \mu - \frac{\epsilon}{4\mu^2}\int_0^\infty dT\, a(T)\,\left(\mu^2 - \partial_T^2\right)^2\left[A^0_{\mathcal{C}}(T) - A^0(T)\right]$$
$$= \mu\left\{1 - \epsilon\frac{2\mu}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \frac{a(T)}{[1-\exp(-2\mu T)]^{3/2}}dT\right\}. \qquad (16)$$

The final result is remarkably compact. Since $\epsilon a(T)$ is just the perturbation to the Markov correlator $A^0(T) = e^{-\mu T}$, the normalization $A(T) = 1$ forces $a(0) = 0$. This is sufficient to converge the integral in (16) provided $a(T)$ vanishes more rapidly than $T^{1/2}$. Eq. (16) has recently been used to calculate persistence exponents for interface growth in a class of generalized Edwards-Wilkinson models [13].

As was remarked earlier, the problem of nonequilibrium critical dynamics is Markovian to first order in $\epsilon = 4 - d$. In the thermodynamic limit the global order parameter is Gaussian because, at time t, it is the sum of $[L/\xi(t)]^d$ (essentially) statistically independent contributions, where L is the system size and $\xi \sim t^{1/z}$ is the length scale over which critical correlations have been established. Corrections to the Gaussian distribution can be expressed in terms of higher cumulants of the normalized total magnetization $M(t)/\langle M^2(t)\rangle^{1/2}$. Using the translational invariance of the system with respect to space it is easy to show that for large L the $2N$-point cumulant is smaller by a factor $(t^{1/z}/L)^{(N-1)d}$ compared to the Gaussian part of the $2N$-point correlation function. The perturbative approach discussed in the first part of this Communication can therefore be applied. To calculate the lowest non-Markovian term in θ, we need to calculate the autocorrelation function of the total magnetization $M(t)$ to order ϵ^2, i.e. we need to calculate the autocorrelation function $A(t_1,t_2) = \langle M(t_1)M(t_2)\rangle/\langle M^2(t_1)\rangle^{1/2}\langle M^2(t_2)\rangle^{1/2}$, which in the scaling regime depends only on the ratio t_2/t_1. The necessary techniques of dynamical field-theory, incorporating the extra renormalization associated with the random initial condition (and responsible for the nonequilibrium exponent λ), have been developed by Janssen et al [15,16]. We first consider 'model A' dynamics [17] for a nonconserved $O(n)$ model (where 'persistence' is associated with a given component of the order parameter for $n > 1$). The calculation is straightforward in principle (but algebraically tedious), and the final result is (with $T = \ln(t_2/t_1)$)

$$A(T) = e^{-\mu T}\left[1 - \frac{3(n+2)}{4(n+8)^2}\epsilon^2 F_A\left(e^T\right) + O(\epsilon^3)\right], \quad (17)$$

where $\mu = (\lambda - d + 1 - \eta/2)/z$ from the one-loop calculation [11] (equivalent to the 'Markov scaling relation'), and

$$F_A(x) =$$
$$-\ln\frac{4}{3}\left[2\ln(2x) + (x-1)\ln(x-1) - (x+1)\ln(x+1)\right]$$
$$-2\left(\ln 2\right)^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6} + 4\ln 2 - (x-1)\ln\left(\frac{x-1}{2x}\right)$$
$$+(x+1)\ln\left(\frac{x+1}{2x}\right) + (x-1)\ln\left(\frac{x-1}{2x}\right)\ln\left(\frac{3x-1}{2x}\right)$$
$$-(x+1)\ln\left(\frac{x+1}{2x}\right)\ln\left(\frac{3x+1}{2x}\right)$$
$$-(3x+1)\ln\left(\frac{3x+1}{2x}\right) + (3x-1)\ln\left(\frac{3x-1}{2x}\right)$$
$$-\frac{(x-1)}{2}\left[\ln\left(\frac{3x-1}{2x}\right)\right]^2 + \frac{(x+1)}{2}\left[\ln\left(\frac{3x+1}{2x}\right)\right]^2$$
$$-(x-1)\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{x-1}{2x}\right) + (x+1)\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{x+1}{2x}\right)$$
$$-2(x+1)\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{x+1}{4x}\right) + 2(x-1)\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{x-1}{4x}\right)$$
$$+(x+1)\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{2x}{3x+1}\right) - (x-1)\mathrm{Li}_2\left(\frac{2x}{3x-1}\right),$$

and $\mathrm{Li}_2(x) \equiv -\int_0^x dt\, \ln(1-t)/t$ is the dilogarithm function. The function $F_A(e^T)$ is a bounded, monotonically increasing, function of T in $(0,\infty)$. It vanishes as $T\ln T$ for $T \to 0$ [satisfying the requirement for convergence at $T = 0$ of the integral in (16)], while $F(\infty) = 0.057622\ldots$

The non-Markov nature of the process $M(t)$ at order ϵ^2 follow from the fact that, at this order, $A(T)$ is no longer a simple exponential. Substituting $a(T) = A(T) - e^{-\mu T}$ from (17) into Eqn. (16), using $\mu = (1/2) + O(\epsilon)$, we find (after some algebra)

$$\theta = \mu\left\{1 + \frac{3(n+2)}{4(n+8)^2}\epsilon^2\alpha\right\}, \qquad (18)$$

where

$$\alpha = 4\left(\sqrt{2} - 2\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{6}\right) + 8\sqrt{2}\ln 2 - 4\left(\sqrt{2}-1\right)\ln 3$$
$$-2\left(1+2\sqrt{2}\right)\ln\left(3+2\sqrt{2}\right) - 14\ln\left(5+2\sqrt{6}\right)$$
$$+10\ln\left(7+4\sqrt{3}\right) + 8\sqrt{2}\ln\left(\frac{4+\sqrt{2}-\sqrt{6}}{4-\sqrt{2}-\sqrt{6}}\right)$$
$$-4\sqrt{2}\ln\left(\frac{2\sqrt{3}-2+\sqrt{2}}{2\sqrt{3}-2-\sqrt{2}}\right)$$
$$= 0.271577604975\ldots$$

This result can be compared with recent simulation data for the Ising model in 2 [11,19,20] and 3 [19] dimensions. For $d = 2$, using $\lambda = 1.585 \pm 0.006$ [21], and $\eta = 1/4$ (exact) gives $\mu z = 0.460 \pm 0.006$. Ignoring non-Markov corrections, one would obtain $\theta z = \mu z$, smaller

than the measured value $\theta z = 0.505 \pm 0.020$ (the finite-size scaling method used in [11] naturally determines the combination θz [20]). The non-Markov correction factor in (18) is, for $n = 1$, $(1 + 0.0075438\ldots\epsilon^2) \simeq 1.030$ for $\epsilon = 2$. The 'improved' estimate for θz becomes 0.474 ± 0.006, closer to, but still somewhat smaller than, the numerical estimate.

For $d = 3$, one has $z = 2.032 \pm 0.004$, $\lambda = 2.789 \pm 0.006$ [21] and $\eta = 0.032 \pm 0.003$, giving $\mu = 0.380 \pm 0.003$. Multiplying by the non-Markov correction factor for $\epsilon = 1$, i.e. 1.0075, gives $\theta = 0.383 \pm 0.003$, compared to the numerical result $\theta \simeq 0.41$ [19]. A direct expansion to order ϵ^2, using the known expansions for z, λ, and η, gives (specializing to $n = 1$) $\theta = 1/2 - \epsilon/12 + (\alpha - 2\ln 3)\epsilon^2/72 - 2\epsilon^2/81 + O(\epsilon^3)$, i.e. $\theta \simeq 0.365$ for $d = 3$, slightly lower than that obtained using the best numerical estimates of z, λ and η and only using the ϵ-expansion for the non-Markov correction.

A similar approach can be applied to 'model C' critical dynamics [17], in which a nonconserved order parameter field is coupled to a conserved density. In this case, one obtains non-Markovian corrections already at order ϵ. The autocorrelation function is given by (for $n = 1$)

$$A(T) = \exp(-\mu T)\left[1 - \frac{\epsilon}{6} F_C(e^T) + O(\epsilon^2)\right] \tag{19}$$

$$F_C(x) = \ln 2 - \frac{x-1}{2x} + x \ln x - \frac{x-1}{2}\ln(x-1) - \frac{x+1}{2}\ln(x+1). \tag{20}$$

Again, $F_C(e^T)$ vanishes like $T \ln T$ for $T \to 0$, while $F_C(\infty) = \ln 2 - 1/2$. Inserting $a(T) = A(T) - \exp(-\mu T)$ from (19) into (16) gives

$$\theta = \mu\left[1 + \frac{7 - 4\sqrt{2}}{12}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)\right], \tag{21}$$

where $\mu = (\lambda - d + 1 - \eta/2)/z$ as before, but now the dynamical exponents z and λ take their model-C values [17,18].

In summary, we have computed to order ϵ^2 the persistence exponent θ for the global order parameter $M(t)$ of models A and C. At this order, the dynamics of $M(t)$ are non-Markovian, and θ is a new exponent, not related to the usual static and dynamic exponents. The calculation was performed by expanding around a Markov process, using a simplified form of the perturbation theory introduced by Majumdar and Sire.

The work of SC and AB was supported by EPSRC grants GR/K53208 and GR/J24782 and the work of KO was supported by grant Oe199/1-1 of the DFG.

[1] B. Derrida, A. J. Bray, and C. Godrèche, J. Phys. A **27**, L357 (1994).
[2] A. J. Bray, B. Derrida, and C. Godrèche, Europhys. Lett. **27**, 175 (1994).
[3] D. Stauffer, J. Phys. A **27**, 5029 (1994).
[4] E. Ben-Naim, P. L. Krapivsky, and S. Redner, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 2474 (1994).
[5] B. Derrida, P. M. C. de Oliveira, and D. Stauffer, Physics A **224**, 604 (1996).
[6] B. Derrida, V. Hakim, and V. Pasquier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 751 (1995).
[7] E. Ben-Naim, L. Frachebourg, and P. L. Krapivsky, Phys. Rev. E **53**, 3078 (1996).
[8] S. N. Majumdar and C. Sire, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1420 (1996).
[9] S. N. Majumdar, C. Sire, A. J. Bray, and S. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2867 (1996).
[10] B. Derrida, V. Hakim, and R. Zeitak, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2971 (1996).
[11] S. N. Majumdar, A. J. Bray, S. J. Cornell, and C. Sire, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3704 (1996).
[12] The result (16) can be deduced after some algebra from Eqs. (4), (5) and (7) of ref. [8].
[13] J. Krug, H. Kallabis, S. N. Majumdar, S. Cornell, A. J. Bray, and C. Sire, unpublished.
[14] Note that $A_C^0(\infty) > 0$ [see Eq. (15)], so $\tilde{A}_C^0(\omega)$ implicitly contains a term proportional to $\delta(\omega)$.
[15] H. K. Janssen, B. Schaub, and B. Schmittman, Z. Phys. **73**, 539 (1989).
[16] H. K. Janssen, in *From Phase Transitions to Chaos, Topics in Modern Statistical Physics*, edited by G. Györgyi, I. Kondor, L. Sasvári, and T. Tél (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992), pp. 68–91.
[17] P. C. Hohenberg and B. I. Halperin, Rev. Mod. Phys. **49**, 435 (1977).
[18] K. Oerding and H. K. Janssen, J. Phys. A **26**, 3369 (1993).
[19] D. Stauffer, Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **7**, 753 (1996).
[20] L. Schülke and B. Zheng, preprint, have recently measured θ directly for the Ising model in $d = 2$. Their result $\theta = 0.237 \pm 0.003$ is consistent with $\theta z = 0.505 \pm 0.020$ [11] for z in the accepted range 2.13–2.17.
[21] P. Grassberger, Physica **214A**, 547 (1995).